Restoration (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700571

A. List of Restoration Activities

This Tahoe National Forest (TNF) restoration grant request is comprised of three components: 1) a restoration project on the American River Ranger District (ARRD), 2) a restoration project on the Yuba River Ranger District (YRRD), and 3) effectiveness monitoring of past TNF restoration projects and determinations if additional actions are needed to meet restoration objectives.

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) – Restrict all motorized access to 3 problematic dispersed OHV staging/camping areas and almost one mile of undesignated OHV route in the Sugar Pine OHV area to address concerns over resource impacts and threats to human health, while allowing the area to naturally revegetate. Under this restoration grant, the primary deliverable is the placing of numerous, large boulders to effectively eliminate all motorized access to the identified problem areas. The proposed boulders will be approximately 3 feet in diameter, weigh approximately a ton, and will be located immediately adjacent to each other. Based on professional experience, these large heavy boulders are required to prevent OHV users from “reopening” the area with the vehicles and winches some OHV users typically utilize to transport their motorcycle or ATV to their staging location. The tight spacing between the boulders is needed to eliminate all unauthorized motorized use in the area, including motorcycles. To complete the work, the TNF proposes to rent an excavator, utilize existing Forest Service machinery, and purchase a new 480 SWECO (see discussion below). The project area is located approximately five miles from the Sugar Pine and Parker Flat designated staging areas.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - Obliterate approximately 6 miles of routes, consisting of 14 segments, to eliminate vehicular use, restore the natural hydrologic function, and reestablish vegetative cover. The obliteration work would consist of decompacting the soil, recontouring the route prism, stormproofing and blocking future access to motor vehicles. An excavator would be used to implement the project. Natural drainages would be reestablished, locally available woody debris would be placed to arrest erosion and block vehicle access. The project area is located near the communities of Goodyears Bar and Downieville.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - Monitor the effectiveness of past TNF restoration projects. Determine if additional actions are needed to ensure that all restoration objectives are being met. The past TNF restoration projects to be monitored include: Pierce River and Camp, Rattlesnake/Murphy Flat, Chalk, Bowman, Whiterock Lake, Rubicon, Merrall Chrome Mine, Fisherman's Access Road, Alder, Prosser, Rubicon, Stockrest, and TK River.

B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) – The Finning Mill restoration project on the ARRD will address ongoing OHV-related resource impacts and public health issues along the Finning Mill road in the Sugar Pine OHV area. Current resource issues include impacts to riparian areas, soils, and vegetation (including sensitive plant species). The impacted area includes a serpentine meadow, which is wet much of the year. Increasing levels of visitation, along with a lack of proximate bathroom facilities, is resulting in a widespread area dominated by unmanaged human waste. Both types of impacts are largely driven by increasing levels of dispersed OHV staging in the area, and especially dispersed overnight camping by OHV users. To address these issues, the ARRD proposes to utilize numerous, large boulders to restrict all motorized access to three problematic dispersed overnight camping areas and associated non-designated OHV routes (approximately 5,000 feet of combined route) along the Finning Mill road.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - The 14 segments of routes to be obliterated have their origin in old timber sales and mining. However, the routes are no longer needed for these purposes, as determined under the Ruby (2/28/2006) and Red Ant (6/28/2007) environmental analyses. Efforts to close these routes have been made non-effective due to OHV use. OHV riders continue to utilize these routes and have broken down the drainage structures (water bars) intended to mitigate erosion until the routes naturally revegetated. However, due to the continued OHV use ruts have developed on some of these routes, and natural vegetation has not been able to fully reestablish.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - Spot monitoring of past TNF restoration projects by OHV specialists and resource personnel have shown that some of our previous restorative efforts have been purposely compromised by OHV riders. Corrective actions, like resetting displaced large boulders, have been completed when required. The funding of this grant request would ensure: 1) monitoring of previous restoration projects; 2) if monitoring indicates remedial actions are needed to meet restoration objectives, those actions will be followed up on (may have to ask for additional monies), and; 3) OHV use does not continue to adversely impact restored environments.

Attached with this restoration project is the TNF request for a new 480 SWECO. While this SWECO is expected to be typically parked in Foresthill, it will be utilized for projects across the TNF. The Forest expects to utilize this SWECO for numerous OHV management activities, including ground operations, restoration, and development. The existing 450 SWECO was purchased in the mid-1990s with project dollars (not CA OHV monies). This SWECO has been rebuilt once already, and is needing increasing amounts of yearly maintenance.

The new 480 SWECO is needed for a number of reasons. Foremost, our existing SWECO is nearing the end of it's useful life; it is becoming increasingly expensive to maintain. The 480 will provide more power, and associated productivity. The enclosed cab, with air filtration system and air conditioning, will provide our maintenance staff a greater level of comfort and safety. The ability to utilize two SWECOs at once during critical times of soil moisture (especially in the spring) will dramatically increase the Forest's ability to complete motorized trail work. Finally, as OHV visitation continues to expand, as we predict, the 2nd SWECO will position the TNF to better manage those increasing demands.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) - This project would block access to three dispersed camping areas totaling approximately two acres in size, and about 5,000 feet of user created non-designated routes. To complete this project, and additional restoration and ground maintenance work, the TNF requests monies to purchase a new 480 SWECO with enclosed cab, providing an air purification system, and air conditioning. The purchase would also include monies for critical attachments including hydrolic rippers, a blade, and a six ton winch. See previous section for SWECO justification.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - This project would obliterate the following route mileages:

Route	Miles
30-5	0.2
30-6	0.1
30-7	0.1
30-8	0.5
302-12-1	0.5
302-17	0.5
509-7-6	0.8
509-8	1.2
(6 non-system routes)	1.8
TOTAL MILES	5.7

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - Monitoring of 13 past restoration projects, and appropriate follow-up if necessary (may need to request additional monies, depending upon need).

D. Monitoring and Methodology

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) – After the boulders are placed, project results will be photographed. The project would be monitored by either a Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) or a Forest Protection Officer (FPO) approximately once per week for the first year and approximately once every two weeks after that. If there is evidence that the closures have been reopened, then actions would be taken to fortify the closure and monitoring frequency would be increased. Once the natural vegetation has reestablished over the sites, the project would be considered fully successful.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - During the implementation of the project the OHV Trails Manager and Hydrologist will monitor the project prior to work starting, and then on a weekly basis. After the obliteration work is completed pictures would be taken of each of the obliterated routes. Then the project would be monitored (with sample pictures taken) at least two times per year by the OHV Trails Manager. If there is evidence that OHV use has undone the blockage and obliteration work, then actions would be taken to fortify the access prevention measures and monitoring frequency would be increased. It is expected take 5 years for the natural vegetation to reclaim the project areas. Once the natural vegetation has reestablished over the sites, then the project would be considered fully successful.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - The relevant resource specialists (hydrologists, wildlife biologists, archaeologists, botanists) and the OHV trail specialists would visit each of the past restoration projects to determine effectiveness of: OHV access barricades; revegetation status; and drainage function. Any unsuccessful components of the restorative work would be identified and plans made for corrective action. Full success would be attained when revegetation reaches 70% coverage, vehicle barriers are not breached, an absence of rilling or rutting, with fully functional drainages. Frequency of the monitoring would be no less than one site visit per project per year for three years (2011-2013). Projects determined to need additional remedial actions would be monitored more frequently based on the identified needs.

From a broader Foresthill Ranger District/Sugar Pine perspective, the adaptive management being utilized by the District in this round of grant applications is expected to continue into the future. For example, in 2006 the District applied for and received monies to construct a wood fence to restrict access to the above dispersed sites along the Finning Mill Road. Unfortunately, in the interim, an unknown party removed the constructed fence. In response, the District is returning for additional funds to now utilize boulders to implement the motorized access to these heavily impacted dispersed sites. In another example, the District is utilizing multiple techniques to address concerns over the unintended expansion of dispersed staging and camping areas in the Sugar Pine area. So while we are requesting grant monies in this grant to close access to dispersed sites along the Finning Mill road, we are concurrently applying for a planning grant to transform a different dispersed site at the junction of Brimstone and Hollow Log roads into a new, designated staging area (Brimstone Staging Area).

From a larger Forest perspective, the TNF expects this Finning Mill restoration project will be one of the first of a series of restoration projects the Forest expects to complete over the next few years, with assistance from the OHMVR Division. As the ongoing USFS Travel Management process continues forward, some existing unauthorized routes will be designated for motorized use, while others will be identified for decommissioning and be in need of restoration.

E. List of Reports

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) – A minor NEPA document would be completed prior to the onset of the project.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - NEPA and planning has already been completed for this project (Environmental Assessment for the Ruby Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project , decision document signed 2/28/2006, and; the Environmental Assessment for the Red Ant Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project, decision document signed 6/28/2007).

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - NEPA has already been completed for all the past restoration projects, per previous grant application requirements and submissions.

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

Not Applicable

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) – Signs will be installed at the time of bouldering to inform users the area is closed for resource protection. The project would be monitored by either a Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) or a Forest Protection Officer (FPO) approximately once per week for the first year and approximately once every two weeks after that.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - After the implementation of the obliteration work, signs will be placed at the begining of each route stating that the area is closed for resource protection. The project is also designed to naturally discourage

future OHV use. During the implementation of the project large logs and available rocks would be placed along the routes in sufficient quantities to discourage future OHV use. The recountouring would discourage future use by reestablishing the natural sidehill profile. Special attention would be given at the entrances to these obliterated routes to attempt to disguise any evidence that a route ever existed. In addition, law enforcement (LEO and FPO) patrols would periodically monitor the sites.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - The proposed monitoring will determine if the existing signs and barriers are still in place and effective. If it is determined that some of these items are not effective, plans would be made to take corrective action. In addition, law enforcement (LEO and FPO) patrols would periodically monitor each of the sites for the second and third years.

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700571

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

Ruby Restoration Project Maps (2) Yuba River RD
Finning Mill Vicinity Map
Finning Mill Restoration Map w GPS

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

Ruby Restoration Project Sample Photos
Finning Mill Restoration Photo1
Finning Mill Restoration Photo2

Project Cost Estimate

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # _____		
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Tahoe National Forest		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration (FINAL)	**PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :**	G09-02-20-R01
PROJECT TYPE :	☐ Acquisition ☐ Development ☐ Education & Safety ☐ Ground Operations ☐ Law Enforcement ☐ Planning ☑ Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	This Tahoe National Forest (TNF) restoration grant request is comprised of three components: 1) a restoration project on the American River Ranger District (ARRD), 2) a restoration project on the Yuba River Ranger District (YRRD), and 3) effectiveness monitoring of past TNF restoration projects and determinations if additional actions are needed to meet restoration objectives. ARRD (Finning Mill Project) – Restrict all motorized access to 3 problematic dispersed OHV staging/camping areas and almost one mile of undesignated OHV route in the Sugar Pine OHV area to address concerns over resource impacts and threats to human health, while allowing the area to naturally revegetate. Under this restoration grant, the primary deliverable is the placing of numerous, large boulders to effectively eliminate all motorized access to the identified problem areas. The proposed boulders will be approximately 3 feet in diameter, weigh approximately a ton, and will be located immediately adjacent to each other. Based on professional experience, these large heavy boulders are required to prevent OHV users from “reopening” the area with the vehicles and winches some OHV users typically utilize to transport their motorcycle or ATV to their staging location. The tight spacing between the boulders is needed to eliminate all unauthorized motorized use in the area, including motorcycles. To complete the work, the TNF proposes to rent an excavator, utilize existing Forest Service machinery, and purchase a new 480 SWECO (see discussion below). The project area is located approximately five miles from the Sugar Pine and Parker Flat designated staging areas. YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - Obliterate approximately 6 miles of routes, consisting of 14 segments, to eliminate vehicular use, restore the natural hydrologic function, and reestablish vegetative cover. The obliteration work would consist of decompacting the soil, recontouring the route prism, stormproofing and blocking future access to motor vehicles. An excavator would be used to implement the project. Natural drainages would be reestablished, locally available woody debris would be placed to arrest erosion and block vehicle access. The project area is located near the communities of Goodyears Bar and Downieville. TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - Monitor the effectiveness of past TNF restoration projects. Determine if additional actions are needed to ensure that all restoration objectives are being met. The past TNF restoration projects to be monitored include: Pierce River and Camp, Rattlesnake/Murphy Flat, Chalk, Bowman, Whiterock Lake, Rubicon, Merrall Chrome Mine, Fisherman's Access Road, Alder, Prosser, Rubicon, Stockrest, and TK River.		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	**Staff**						

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-TNF Equip Operator (RC)	42.000	260.000	DAY	10,920.00	0.00	10,920.00
	Other-TNF Swamper (RC)	42.000	160.000	DAY	6,720.00	0.00	6,720.00
	Other-TNF Road Crew Supervisor	35.000	400.000	DAY	12,000.00	2,000.00	14,000.00
	Other-YR OHV Trails Manager	45.000	400.000	DAY	16,000.00	2,000.00	18,000.00
	Other-LEO	12.000	350.000	DAY	0.00	4,200.00	4,200.00
	Other-YR Hydrologist	34.000	390.000	DAY	11,700.00	1,560.00	13,260.00
	Other-YR Hydrologist	15.000	340.000	DAY	5,100.00	0.00	5,100.00
	Other-YR Wildlife Biologist	15.000	390.000	DAY	5,850.00	0.00	5,850.00
	Other-YR Botonist	15.000	425.000	DAY	6,375.00	0.00	6,375.00
	Other-AR Trails Specialist (ML)	20.000	320.000	DAY	6,400.00	0.00	6,400.00
	Other-AR Trails Specialist (KE)	15.000	211.000	DAY	3,165.00	0.00	3,165.00
	Other-AR Temps (x2)	20.000	140.000	DAY	2,800.00	0.00	2,800.00
	Other-TNF Equipment Operator (WH)	10.000	261.000	DAY	2,610.00	0.00	2,610.00
	Other-AR Wildlife Biologist (MT)	2.000	370.000	DAY	740.00	0.00	740.00
	Other-AR Archeologist (NS)	2.000	313.000	DAY	626.00	0.00	626.00
	Other-AR Recreation Officer (MT)	2.000	333.000	DAY	666.00	0.00	666.00
	Other-EZ OHV Program Mag (JW)	10.000	323.000	DAY	3,230.00	0.00	3,230.00
	Other-EZ OHV Specialist (SJ)	10.000	245.000	DAY	2,450.00	0.00	2,450.00
	Total for Staff				97,352.00	9,760.00	107,112.00
2	**Contracts**						
	Other-TNF 2011 Rest. Contr. Legacy	5.000	10000.000	MI	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
	Other-TNF 2012 Rest. Contr. Legacy	1.000	50000.000	PKG	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-ARBarrier Boulder Delivery	40.000	500.000	EA	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
	Total for Contracts				20,000.00	100,000.00	120,000.00
3	**Materials / Supplies**						
	Signs	25.000	20.000	EA	500.00	0.00	500.00
	Other-Recycled Straw Waddles	500.000	1.300	FT	650.00	0.00	650.00
	Other-Wooden Stakes	200.000	0.200	EA	40.00	0.00	40.00
	Other-AR Truck Load Boulders	40.000	500.000	EA	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies				21,190.00	0.00	21,190.00
4	**Equipment Use Expenses**						
	Other-Excavator Rental	2.000	5500.000	MOS	11,000.00	0.00	11,000.00
	Other-Equipment Transport	3.000	600.000	EA	1,800.00	0.00	1,800.00
	Other-YR TNF Mileage (RC)	6500.000	0.500	MI	3,250.00	0.00	3,250.00
	Other-YR Specialist mileage	4000.000	0.500	MI	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
	Other-AR FS Backhoe	10.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
	Other-AR FS SWECO tractor	10.000	250.000	DAY	0.00	2,500.00	2,500.00
	Other-AR Backhoe Transport (r.t.)	1.000	1000.000	EA	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				18,050.00	7,500.00	25,550.00
5	**Equipment Purchases**						
	Other-SWECO 480 Trail Tractor w/enclosed	1.000	105000.000	EA	105,000.00	0.00	105,000.00
6	**Others**						
7	**Indirect Costs**						
	Indirect Costs-TNF Admin Staff	1.000	15000.000	EA	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
Total Program Expenses					276,592.00	117,260.00	393,852.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					276,592.00	117,260.00	393,852.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					**276,592.00**	**117,260.00**	**393,852.00**

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	97,352.00	9,760.00	107,112.00	
2	Contracts	20,000.00	100,000.00	120,000.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	21,190.00	0.00	21,190.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	18,050.00	7,500.00	25,550.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	105,000.00	0.00	105,000.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		276,592.00	117,260.00	393,852.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		276,592.00	117,260.00	393,852.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		**276,592.00**	**117,260.00**	**393,852.00**	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700571

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? (Please select Yes or No) ◉ Yes ○ No

ITEM 2

b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a “Project” under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? (Please select Yes or No) ◉ Yes ○ No

d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ○ No

e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - NEPA (Environmental Assessments) have already been completed for these ground disturbing projects (Environmental Assessment for the Ruby Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project , decision document signed 2/28/2006, and; the Environmental Assessment for the Red Ant Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project, decision document signed 6/28/2007). Based on those analyses there would be no significant impact to wetlands, navigable waters (NA), and sensitive habitats and species (including threatened and endangered species).

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - NEPA (Environmental Assessments) have already been completed for these ground disturbing projects (Environmental Assessment for the Ruby Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project , decision document signed 2/28/2006, and; the Environmental Assessment for the Red Ant Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project, decision document signed 6/28/2007). Based on those analyses there would be no significant cumulative impacts to the environment, either physical or social.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - NEPA (Environmental Assessments) have already been completed for these ground disturbing projects (Environmental Assessment for the Ruby Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project , decision document signed 2/28/2006, and; the Environmental Assessment for the Red Ant Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project, decision document signed 6/28/2007). Based on those analyses there would be no substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The proposed restoration project would ensure that the soil resources are stablized and protected.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - NEPA (Environmental Assessments) have already been completed for these ground disturbing projects (Environmental Assessment for the Ruby Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project , decision document signed 2/28/2006, and; the Environmental Assessment for the Red Ant Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project, decision document signed 6/28/2007). Based on those analyses there would be no damage to scenic resources within the viewshed of an officially designated state scenic highway. The project is not viewable from California State Highway 49.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

DO NOT REMOVE This text

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

ARRD (Finning Mill Project) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

YRRD (Ruby Restoration Project) - NEPA (Environmental Assessments) have already been completed for these ground disturbing projects (Environmental Assessment for the Ruby Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project , decision document signed 2/28/2006, and; the Environmental Assessment for the Red Ant Thinning and Fuels Reduction Project, decision document signed 6/28/2007). Based on those analyses there would be no significant indirect impacts to either the physical, natural or social environments.

TNF (Restoration Monitoring) - NA. Not a ground disturbing activity.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

Ruby Decision Notice & FONSI 2006 02 28
Red Ant Decision Notice & FONSI 2007 06 28

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700571

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 76% or more (10 points)
- ○ 51% - 75% (5 points)
- ◉ 26% - 50% (3 points)
- ○ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 11

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☑ Domestic water supply (4 points)
- ☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
- ☑ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
- ☑ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
- ☑ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [1]
- ☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
- ☐ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

The Sugar Pine OHV area drains immediately into the Sugar Pine reservoir, which provides municipal drinking water for the community of Foresthill. Both YRRD and ARRD projects will reduce adverse effects to watercourses, the TNF restoration monitoring will monitor for these adverse effects. Soils on some of the 14 segments in YRRD are actively eroding, and will be addressed with the requested grant monies. The ARRD project will address OHV impacts to riparian areas.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
- ◉ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
- ○ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
- ○ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
- ○ Management decision (1 point)
- ○ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ○ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

See Red Ant FONSI and Ruby FONSI in ERDS attachments.

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 10

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- [x] Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- [x] Use of native plants and materials
- [x] Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- [x] Educational signage
- [ ] Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Site monitoring is programmed into the project, and would be completed by OHV Trail Specialists, LEOs, and resource specialists. Project would include placement of large boulders and logs to prevent OHV access. Decompaction will stimulate native plant growth and locally available woody debris will be used as erosion mitigation and to block OHV travel. The environmental analyses utilized BMPs in the planning and design of the restoration projects. Signage will be placed at each project site informing users of current activities and the need for resource projection.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ No (No points)
- ◉ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

The Ruby and Red Ant enviromental analyses included public scoping and review, and and those plans were formally adopted by the Forest Service supporting the need for the restoration project.

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Applicant’s operational budget (5 points)
- ○ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ○ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ◉ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 1

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- [ ] Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- [ ] Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- [x] Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

In the last couple of years, ongoing input has been received from OHV stakeholders on the American River Ranger District, especially in regard to the Finning Mill area.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 4 or more (4 points)
- ○ 2 to 3 (2 points)
- ○ 1 (1 point)
- ◉ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
- ☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
- ☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
- ☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ No (No points)
- ○ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
- ○ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- ◉ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ○ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)